

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,005	SCHEIDELL, MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arezoo Sherkat	2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arezoo Sherkat. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Steven Greenberg. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

A. Sherkat 5/15/07
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Greenberg suggested a proposed amendment and explained the gist of what Applicant believes to be their invention. However, Examiner did not have a copy of the agenda to review it before the interview because it had been faxed to the wrong fax number, and further consideration and/or search would be required upon receiving the formal response. No agreement was reached as to allowability of any of the claims at this stage.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Greenberg suggested a proposed amendment and explained the gist of what Applicant believes to be their invention. However, Examiner did not have a copy of the agenda to review it before the interview because it had been faxed to the wrong fax number, and further consideration and/or search would be required upon receiving the formal response. No agreement was reached as to allowability of any of the claims at this stage.